## IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF SOUTH CAROLINA

Reginald Anthony Hunter,	) C/A No. 0:20-2695-RMG-PJC
	)
Plaintiff,	)
v.	ORDER
United States Government; Federal Bureau of	)
Prisons; FCI Bennettsville; N. Canada; J.	)
Onuoha; J. Berrios; A. Anderson; S. Slone; N.	)
Rosario; B. Olive; Coffman,	)
	)
Defendants.	)

Plaintiff Reginald Anthony Hunter, a self-represented federal prisoner, filed this action pursuant to <u>Bivens v. Six Unknown Named Agents of Federal Bureau of Narcotics</u>, 403 U.S. 388 (1971), alleging a violation of his constitutional rights. This matter is before the court on the plaintiff's motion for appointment of counsel. (ECF No. 67.)

There is no right to appointed counsel in § 1983 cases. <u>Hardwick v. Ault</u>, 517 F.2d 295 (5th Cir. 1975). The court may use its discretion to request counsel to represent an indigent in a civil action. <u>See</u> 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(1); <u>Mallard v. United States Dist. Court for S. Dist. of Iowa</u>, 490 U.S. 296 (1989). However, such discretion "should be allowed only in exceptional cases." <u>Cook v. Bounds</u>, 518 F.2d 779, 780 (4th Cir. 1975). Whether exceptional circumstances are present depends on the type and complexity of the case, and the pro se litigant's ability to prosecute it. <u>Whisenant v. Yuam</u>, 739 F.2d 160 (4th Cir. 1984), <u>abrogated on other grounds by Mallard</u>, 490 U.S. 296.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> In <u>Bivens</u>, the United States Supreme Court established a cause of action against federal officials for the violation of federal constitutional rights. A <u>Bivens</u> claim is analogous to a claim under 42 U.S.C. § 1983 against state actors.

Upon review of the file, the court has determined that there are no exceptional or unusual circumstances presented at this time, nor would the plaintiff be denied due process if the court denied plaintiff's request for counsel. <u>Id.</u> Based on the pleadings before the court, the plaintiff writes well and appears capable of addressing the legal issues. Accordingly, the plaintiff's motion requesting counsel under 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(1) is denied.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

February 23, 2021 Columbia, South Carolina

Paige J. Gossett

UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE